

The Sun.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1895.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the Sun, 100 Nassau Street, New York, will be glad to receive for publication all news items of local interest. All communications should be addressed to the press of the whole country.

The Real Feeling.

A British-born clergyman, addressing an association of natives of Great Britain at a Fifth Avenue hotel on Thursday evening, said that a war between America and England would be a "frightful conflict." The two countries, he declared, are bound together by "the ties of race and interest" as "the children of a common mother."

Even if this were true, it would have no influence in preventing war between the two countries. At the time of the Revolution, when it was true, in large measure, it did not prevent a desperate war, lasting for seven years. It did not prevent them from again coming to blows in 1812. Since that period, and more especially during the last fifty years, the population of this country of distinctively English blood has been reduced to a minority; and even that minority there are comparatively few who cherish any affection toward England. Americans of the Revolutionary stock are usually far from tenderly disposed toward the "common mother." They inherit hatred rather than love of her. The prevailing feeling in this country, inherited by the people coming from other races, is generally very much the same. They have no ties of blood to England, and no affection for her. That is not strange, for nowhere in the world is England loved.

It is this prevalent and practically unanimous American sentiment regarding England, which makes the policy of Mr. Cleveland's message so grateful to our people. If the controversy about Venezuela had arisen with any other country of Europe, it would have provoked comparatively little popular interest. It would not have aroused great public excitement; and hence the settlement of the difficulty amicably would have been easier. If the improbable, almost impossible, result of the difference should be war between England and America, the appeal to arms would be supported by a national sentiment here which would express a bitterness of hostility never before exceeded in the history of war.

That would be a certain consequence of an open rupture between the two countries of which all Englishmen, whether here or at home, should be made to have a full understanding. The talk about fraternal love, and affection for a common mother, deceives nobody here, and probably few there. There is no such love. The feeling is rather of hatred.

Hence the diplomatic discussion of the Venezuelan question should be throughout cautious and sagacious, with a view to reaching a decision which will command the respect of the American people by reason of its fairness and justice. The peace of the world is at issue in these negotiations concerning a strip of South American territory; and because the issue is so tremendous we assume that they will terminate peacefully. However, of kindling into a consuming flame the passionate American animosity toward England!

Sustain the President!

Any American citizen, whether inside or outside of Congress, who hesitates at this juncture to uphold the President of the United States, should be branded as an alien or a traitor. The game of politics is out of place to-day. There is no room for any but patriots from Maine to Texas and from Oregon to Florida.

There can be no halting and no shuffling at this time. There are crises when lukewarmness is betrayal. By an outburst of approval, which for unanimity is without a parallel in our history, the people of the United States have signified their determination to back their President in the Venezuelan business. It was the voice of the nation which was echoed, when by a unique and memorable exception in legislative experience, the course advised by our Chief Magistrate in a matter of tremendous moment received the instant and unanimous assent of the House of Representatives, followed yesterday by that of the Senate, which has shown itself no less sensitive to the wave of enthusiasm which has swept over the republic; no less keenly appreciative of the wise and magnanimous position assumed by the Executive; nor less prompt and single-hearted in its testimony of support and confidence.

Protean are the disguises of perfidy, but in this instance none of them will avail. The people will see through them all. Awakened as by a trumpet blast to a sense of its duty and its mission on this continent, the nation cannot be deluded or dismayed. In the eye of public opinion, fixed upon lofty and momentous interests, any attempt at this hour to paralyze the arm of the Executive will seem as shameful as a mutiny at sea. For the moment there is but one chart to follow, one course to steer, one pilot to obey. The large-minded and righteous policy announced in the President's message will never be disavowed or side-tracked; and our present paramount and urgent business is to make the world understand that this is the unanimous and irrevocable decision of the country. The chariot that bears the Monroe standard will move right on.

No politician and no financier should imagine that he can hoodwink any one as to the character of the motives that may impel him to try to trammel or thwart the President when he gives utterance to the noblest traditions and the highest obligations of a mighty commonwealth. The advocates of peace at any price might as well butt their heads against a rock, as seek to divorce the nation from a programme which vindicates its majesty and honor and proclaims its duty and its destiny. He who would have us halt or swerve in the upward path on which we have now entered, is guilty of egregious folly as well as of a mean disloyalty. In the world's history there was never a conjuncture at which an unflinching readiness for war offered a more certain

guarantee of peace. But for the almost incredible ignorance regarding the feelings and convictions of genuine Americans, in which the people and statesmen of Great Britain have been content to dwell, an ignorance which we have been wont to look upon as ludicrous, but which must now be termed deplorable, Lord Salisbury would never have rejected President Cleveland's well-grounded request for a reference of the Venezuela boundary to arbitration. He would have remembered that a similar boundary controversy, that relating to the island of St. Juan, was submitted by England to arbitrators. He would have recalled the still more pertinent fact that one of his predecessors in the Foreign Office, Lord Granville, agreed in June, 1885, that this very Venezuela question should be settled by an impartial tribunal. Those precedents would have had their proper weight with any British statesman, charged with grave responsibilities, had he been qualified by an adequate knowledge of this country to foresee that the American people, without distinction of section or of party, and with a burst of unanimity unequalled since the foundation of our Government, would support Mr. Cleveland in the stand made in his memorable message.

What Englishmen knew not, they know now. They will never forget the knowledge, and we believe that they will profit by it. Already there are signs in England that the tide is turning in the direction of common sense, and of a decent recognition of the fact that, if the claims of British Guiana are just, they can have nothing to fear from an impartial tribunal. The London Chronicle, which has kept its head, while its contemporaries have shown as much fury and bewilderment as if a sheep had bitten them, has twice within a week declared that "the American suggestion of a reference to umpires is not unreasonable," and regards it as of "vital consequence" to all concerned that "the controversy shall as far as possible further rather than retard the principle of international arbitration." As the days pass and forethought spreads, a larger and larger number of sober-minded Englishmen are likely to agree with Prof. Goldwin Smith, who, without attempting, any more than Mr. Cleveland has done, to prejudice the merits of the Venezuelan question, recognizes that all boundary controversies, instead of being unduly, are, preliminarily suited for arbitration.

Alike for those who desire peace and for those who fear not war, there is one duty and one watchword: Sustain the President!

The Case of France and Brazil.

It is worth noting that there exists at this time a boundary dispute between French Guiana and Brazil wholly comparable with the one between British Guiana and Venezuela. The two controversies, however, have this fundamental point of difference, that while England refuses to put her before an arbitrator, as it stands, France, if we may credit the words just attributed to M. Delcasse, "has long been demanding the arbitration of her dispute with Brazil."

The more closely these two cases are examined the more remarkable is the parallel in their details, and the more emphatic, therefore, the contrast presented by the refraining of France from encroachment upon the disputed area, and her desire not to settle its ownership by the law of the stronger. In both cases the controversy extends back for centuries—days when lack of geographical knowledge led to vague terms of description in grants and treaties. In both cases the coast as well as the interior is in dispute, the Amazon or Connaught district, over which France and Brazil contend, lying between the Oyapock and Amazon rivers. Finally, in both cases the controversy has become acute within a short time through the discovery of rich gold fields on the disputed tract.

In the Connaught district, too, as in the Yuripari or Caratall district, the influx of miners and others from the neighboring Guiana colony has led to disputes and open violence. The Cayenne authorities have made no talk about, in some respects, no far as acts of violence demanding reparation are concerned, than those of Georgetown. As we all know, the claim of Lord Salisbury upon Venezuela, said to be for \$60,000, as if \$6,000 were not ample, if anything is due to all, rests upon what was at most a slight offence. A couple of British colonial police authorities were arrested, wrongfully they assert, by local authorities. They were promptly released by the Caracas Government, and it is said that compensation was offered them for any injuries to their clothing, or otherwise, they might have received.

But in the case of Brazil the French Capt. Trajan, who commanded the force of armed police stationed by the French Guiana authorities at Caracene, in the disputed mining tract, was seized and was imprisoned at Maps. This, in turn, led to an attack at Maps, as the story goes, by an armed vessel sent by the Governor of Cayenne.

Yet not only has the question of indemnity on the one side or the other been allowed to wait during the settlement of the boundary dispute, but so far as we have observed, no demands have been formulated either by France or Brazil, least to the extent of demanding specified sums. It seems to have been recognized as a matter of course that these conflicts, which were far more severe than the trivial affair on the Uruman, resulting, indeed, in bloodshed and loss of life, had arisen out of the boundary dispute, and should, as far as possible, be subordinated to the latter. The contrast between this course of conduct and Lord Salisbury's demands in the Uruman case, especially if it is to be enforced by a British fleet, is apparent.

And there is one more contrast to be noted in the methods of adjustment employed in these two boundary disputes, otherwise so closely parallel. Half a century and more ago, in the year 1841, just about the time that Schomburgk was drawing his arbitrary line through Venezuela, France and Brazil signed a *modus vivendi* of peace. The former had, during four or five years preceding, established a military post within territory which Brazil considered as hers, but on Brazil's demand, evacuated it in 1840. Then the two countries proceeded to agree that the contested territory should remain neutral, so that it should be used by neither of them, and the encroachments have lately been made upon

it, we may say that it has been practically held as territory whose ownership was in doubt. So far has this policy been carried that several years ago some of the people of Connaught even took steps to set up an independent republic there, until warned by France and Brazil, acting jointly, that these countries held jurisdiction there.

Of course the question of real ownership ought to be settled there as in Venezuela, since a boundary dispute is a cause of friction and peril; and it ought to be settled by peaceful arbitration. But the point to note is that while France seeks such arbitration, she does not begin by drawing a line to which Brazil has never consented through the middle of the disputed tract, saying that she must have everything up to that line to start with, before she will arbitrate as to the rest. The whole question is open, and that, too, in spite of the acknowledged fact that French settlers and miners are on the disputed tract. They went there at their own risk, and France, it appears, will allow an impartial arbitrator to say whether they are on Brazilian or French soil.

Our Comical but Worthless Sheriff.

The ludicrous outcome of the DAMSEN trial in the Court of General Sessions was in perfect harmony and keeping with all that the public knows about DAMSEN. It was not to be supposed that any matter or connected with him might be prominently connected with the trial, and that in an amusing blunder. In this case DAMSEN was the prisoner in the dock, and the wheels of justice were clogged with pretzels.

Since Jan. 1, DAMSEN has been Sheriff of New York. His official record has been a long but amusingly diversified chapter of errors and blunders, some venial, some serious, but all of them laughable. There have been escapes from custody, evasions of court orders, blunders in the service of jury notices, a scandal over the appointment of the Sheriff's auctioneers, accusations of discrimination and favoritism, the appointment of incompetent persons, the appointment of one or more persons awaiting trial under criminal indictment, and finally, last and worst of all, extortionate overcharges, in excess of the statutory allowance, for the services of the auctioneers' combine.

Of the inability of DAMSEN to render to the people of New York any adequate return for the \$20,000 a year which the people are taxed to pay him, there can be no doubt whatever; and the jury which failed to reach a conclusion in the Court of General Sessions on Thursday probably had no doubt of his culpable incompetence. But the question directly before them related to a specific act, or failure to act, of DAMSEN, whereby the three Federal prisoners, KILLORAN, RUSSELL, and ALLEN, escaped from Ludlow street jail on July 7.

The prosecution may be reduced to this: Three prisoners under DAMSEN's custody having escaped, fled, departed, lit out, gone, *unsuborned*, their jailer should be incarcerated as a substitute, a vicarious sacrifice, as it were. Three having gone out, one should be put in. Such seemed to be the cruel logic of the law, but how could it be made to apply in DAMSEN's case? KILLORAN, RUSSELL, and ALLEN, though engaged in the detestable and lawless business of cracksmen, breaking into and pilfering Post Offices, were, as the testimony disclosed to the jury, intelligent, well-to-do, and well-known. They understood the language of the United States, the topography of the country, the location of its public buildings, and the whereabouts of the officers of justice. The law, Federal and State, which persistently and perniciously they were breaking, were well known to them. To the extent that such a comparison is permissible, it may be said that they were adepts at the business to which they devoted themselves. What sort of a substitute for them in a jail would DAMSEN make? He is not alert, wide awake, or intelligent. He does not speak the English language, he does not know the customs of the country, he is unfamiliar with the location of the public buildings even in this city, he knows little of the laws of the United States or of the State of New York, he is without cleverness, cunning, or skill. A score of DAMSENS could not replace a single KILLORAN, RUSSELL, or ALLEN.

Again, the specific charge against DAMSEN, about which the jury in the Court of General Sessions disagreed, was technical in its character. The Sheriff-notary DAMSEN speaks Plattdeutsch; his barber-Warden RAABE speaks Hochdeutsch. DAMSEN gave instructions for the care of the jail in Plattdeutsch. RAABE imperfectly and inaccurately understood them. The divergent views were not one of intent, but one of idiom; and where there is in the city of New York, or in Long Island City or Hoboken either, a man with so much bitterness, venom, and vindictiveness in his heart that, sitting on a jury and serving under oath, he would be willing to incarcerate in a dungeon a man like DAMSEN, whose grievous error it was to suppose that a Fifth street barber could comprehendingly translate and interpret the instructions of an Avenue A notary in a language essentially different from his own?

The difficulty, too, of taking DAMSEN seriously seems to have perplexed the General Sessions jury. Here was a listed and ludicrous Holstein Dane, with hair and whiskers shrouding and concealing every part of his head but his chin, seated in a chair and so frequently mistaken for one of the court attendants that it was necessary for counsel to point to him to make sure of his identity. A jury, not chosen from among the ranks of those favored men who have lively imaginations and superlative sensibilities, was asked to believe that this individual was the same as the candidate chosen high Sheriff and peace officer of this town by a majority of the citizens only a little more than a year ago. Gen. Tracy in his eloquent and instructive argument did not, it is true, raise the question of an alibi for DAMSEN, but the sober sense of the discriminating jurors may have supplied the omission, and those of them who did not vote to convict may have faltered in this because of their belief that there were two DAMSENS. But we assure them that in this they err: there is only one DAMSEN.

The people of the city of New York are not particularly interested in the punishment of DAMSEN. What they seek is what they are paying for, namely, a competent, efficient, and intelligent Sheriff. They will carry out in a watchful, decorous, and proper manner the orders of the Court, and keep in safe custody such prisoners as are committed to his care. Had the General Sessions jury which disagreed on Thursday convicted DAMSEN, he would either have been sent to prison or fined. If he had been fined, who knows but some of the counterfeit money referred to by old BILL VOSHUBG in his testimony, would have been offered by sympathetic German-American miners. DAMSEN, in trifling ignorance of its worthless character? If he had been imprisoned, the examination of the charges filed with Gov-

ernor MORTON by the Hon. HENRY GRASSER and his associate taxpayers, would necessarily have been deferred till the expiration of DAMSEN's term of incarceration. The speedy relief which the people of this city look to Governor MORTON to give them in DAMSEN's case would have been postponed. The action of the jury in the General Sessions case opens up clearly the way to a consideration of these charges by the Governor, and there is no reason to believe that the matter will be longer delayed.

DAMSEN is booked to go. Go he must; and it is a matter of very little difference to the citizens of this town how he goes, providing they are relieved of him.

DAMSEN must go!

The University of Virginia.

To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose.

The Christmas time is all of the year the season when people think the most of giving good gifts to others. As the Christmas of 1896 approaches there are particular reasons why the scores and hundreds and thousands of Southern-born men who have acquired fortunes in the North during the last quarter of a century should remember the University of Virginia, in the benefactions by which they may desire to manifest their good will toward that portion of the land which gave them birth.

In October last the rotunda of the university and its wings were destroyed by fire, the damage amounting to about \$150,000. The college authorities estimate that the restoration of the buildings, the reestablishment of the library, much of which was destroyed, and the other improvements rendered advisable in consequence of the fire, will cost about \$350,000, of which \$200,000 is yet to be raised. The sum of \$58,000 is available from insurance and other resources, and the Chairman of the faculty has already received subscriptions which amount to \$72,000. The Legislature of Virginia will undoubtedly afford some aid, but without further assistance from individuals the sum necessary to maintain the university worthily cannot be obtained.

The appeal is made to alumni and friends of the institution by the committee on the restoration fund ought to strike a responsive chord even among those of Northern birth and associations. The University of Virginia is the most interesting institution of learning in the South. It was founded in 1819 by THOMAS JEFFERSON, who designed the original buildings at Charlottesville, and superintended their erection. Of all the great works of his life, JEFFERSON was most proud of this, as is shown by the inscription which he ordered to be placed over his tomb: "Father of the University of Virginia."

DANIEL WEBSTER, in his famous oration on Adams and JEFFERSON in Faneuil Hall in August, 1820, referred to the university, then only seven years old, in these words: "There is no man, Jefferson was yet another work of patriotism and benevolence, the establishment of a university in his native State. To this object he devoted years of incessant and anxious attention, and he has left to his country a noble monument, the University of Virginia, and the cooperation of other able and zealous friends, he lived to see it accomplished. May all success attend this infant seminary; and may those who enjoy its advantages, as often as their eyes rest on the neighboring heights, recollect that they owe to their distinguished and indefatigable benefactor, and may letters honor him who thus labored in the cause of letters!"

The institution in which JEFFERSON was thus interested at the beginning of the century ought to interest at the end of the century all those who admire the genius and reverence the memory of that great man. And in the North as well as in the South, in the East as well as in the West, there must be many who are both able and willing to assist the University of Virginia when they become aware of its recent trial and its present need.

Silly Decorations for Sailors.

The Constitution of the United States provides that no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of Congress, accept a present, emolument, office, or title of any kind from any king, prince, or foreign State.

On the first day of the present session of Congress, Mr. TURPIE of Indiana introduced in the Senate a bill authorizing the persons therein named to accept certain decorations and testimonials from the late Hawaiian Government. These are the persons and decorations named in the bill:

Rear Admiral GEORGE BROWN, U. S. N., Knight Grand Officer of the Royal Order of Kalakaua.
Ensign GEORGE F. BROW, U. S. N., Royal Order of Kalakaua.
Lieut. GEORGE D. DYER, U. S. N., Knight Companion of the Royal Order of Kalakaua.
FRANK LAYNE, United States steamer Charleston, medal of honor.
Capt. GEORGE C. HENRY, U. S. N., Knight Commander of the Royal Order of Kalakaua.
Medical Inspector GEORGE W. WOOD, U. S. N., Royal Order of Kalakaua.

Mr. TURPIE's bill states that these various decorations were conferred in recognition of services to the late King of the Hawaiian Islands. Some of these services appear to have been rendered upon the occasion of the King's visit to California. We are at a loss to understand, however, how any of the United States navy should perform "services" of any kind for anybody but the Government of the United States.

The term as used in the bill, however, probably means hospitable attention, rather than anything else. But surely it is not worthy of a naval officer to accept decorations simply for playing the agreeable host. We can understand that Congress should allow an officer in the military or naval service of this country to accept a decoration for any act of courage or heroism which chances to be beneficial to a foreign Government, such, for example, as saving life at sea, aiding in the protection of foreigners during a riot, or something of that sort. It seems to us only degrading, however, to permit them to wear medals of an obsolete and semi-savage monarchy, really conferred in recognition, not of any military or marine quality, but simply because they fed a dusky King well and treated him with courtesy.

Justice and Freedom for Cuba.

Mr. SULZER of New York has introduced in the House of Representatives the joint resolution which opens the way for justice and freedom to the Cuban revolutionists:

"That the Government of the United States recognize a condition of public war between the Government of Spain and the Government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the Cuban revolutionists, and that the United States hereby declare that they will maintain a condition of strict neutrality between the contending powers and accord to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States. The Congress of the United States protest and remonstrate against the barbarous manner in which the war in Cuba has been conducted, and the President is hereby authorized to take such steps as may be expedient, in his judgment, to secure an observance of the laws of war as recognized by all civilized nations."

This resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As soon as that committee shall be constituted, Mr. SULZER's joint resolution should receive

prompt consideration, and should come back to the House with a ringing recommendation that it be adopted.

The Senate should pass it likewise, and GROVER CLEVELAND should sign it.

The critical character of our relations with England on the Venezuela question should not prevent or delay this act of justice, this pledge of friendship, and this signal of hope to the heroes of Cuba's war of independence.

What a picture the Jingoism present as they fall in line "behind Cleveland," whom for months and years they have been denouncing as the "traitor" of all that was most dearest in American statesmanhood! What a picture, indeed! It is inspiring to every American heart. And to think, GORDON, that Mr. CLEVELAND might have had this glorious and invincible band behind him all the time, if he had kicked down behind the back stairs three years earlier!

Perhaps the Detroit Dry Dock Company and F. W. WHEELER & Co. of Bay City and all the other enterprising and patriotic shipbuilders on the great lakes may yet have an opportunity to show what their shipyards can do.

Enter again in the classic town of Long Island City, the Hon. PATRICK GLEASON, Mayor. Other statesmen come to a stop, but GLEASON keeps on and on, and Long Island City loves him. He is a hustler. He is an axeman. He is America's GLEASON, except that Mr. GLEASON has retired from public life. His shadow grows with years, and he has elements of a great man. We salute as is proper the rightful Mayor of a sister city.

THE MESSAGE CRITICISED.

One Respect in Which Mr. Cleveland's Position Is Not Monarchical Enough.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Now, that the surprise and gratification over the assertion of any degree of patriotic sentiment from Grover Cleveland has found expression in a number of editorial approvals, it is worth while, perhaps, to consider one of the propositions advanced, and to question whether it is, in fact, such an interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine as is likely to meet with the approval of the people in after years, when a contingency may arise, which, happily, is not probable in this case. In discussing the refusal of England to submit its boundary dispute to arbitration, the President says:

"Great Britain's present position has never thus far been regarded as admissible by Venezuela, though any such assumption of the right to extend her jurisdiction over her own territory, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States."

Is this the Monroe Doctrine? Is the United States Government prepared to assert the doctrine that European powers, in the exercise of their ignorance, the cowardice, or the cupidity of the temporary Governments of South America, may extend their systems to this continent at will, and without objection on the part of the United States? This certainly is not the language of the Monroe Doctrine. It declares:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

This language was intended to be addressed to the "Holy Alliance," but it asserts the proposition that we will not look with favor upon the extension of European systems; and, continuing, it says:

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have no interference, and will not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, not only to recognize, but to uphold by the aid of our armaments, we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

Mr. Cleveland says that "any adjustment of the boundary which that country may deem for her advantage, and may enter into of her own free will, cannot, of course, be objected to by the United States;" but Mr. Monroe said that any interference for the purpose of "oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

THE AMERICAN DOCTRINE.

Thomas Jefferson's as well as James Monroe's.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The President's message on the Venezuela question has received such a practically unanimous endorsement from all classes of citizens, irrespective of mere political differences, as to show clearly that the patriotic American spirit has been aroused in defence of a doctrine dear to Americans.

It is to be regretted that the message did not contain a fuller statement of the reasons why the Monroe doctrine may be considered as having "its place in the code of international law as certainly and as securely as if it were particularly mentioned," because the European press, from want of better information, are denying the statement.

President James Monroe announced the doctrine in his annual message to Congress on Dec. 2, 1823. It was the outgrowth of suggestions previously made by Mr. Secretary Canning, British Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Mr. Richard Rush, the United States Minister to the United States at the Court of St. James's.

In his message, after alluding to various matters of foreign and domestic concern, President Monroe, in the course of his development of the American doctrine to which his name is now inseparably attached, used these words:

"In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor do we intend to do so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our own defence. With the movement of this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers."

The difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments. And to the defence of our own has been added the duty of extending to much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of our most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed an unexampled felicity, this whole system is involved."

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have no interference, and will not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, not only to recognize, but to uphold by the aid of our armaments, we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

President Monroe further amplified on this question, but the above quotation sufficiently indicates its fixed intent.

The Congress of Verona of 1822 had led to an armed interference by France, under sanction of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, in the internal affairs of Spain. The Spanish Constitution, which the Cortes had established, had accordingly been overthrown and Ferdinand VII. restored to absolute power, and it was supposed an attempt would be made by the allied powers to reduce to submission all the Central and South American States which had revolted against the Spanish empire and had set up independent governments.

Before President Monroe put forth his celebrated message he had referred Mr. Secretary Canning's proposal to ex-President Thomas Jefferson. The Sage of Monticello, in the course of his reply dated Oct. 24, 1823, said:

"Our first man should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with Atlantic affairs."

He advised President Monroe to join with Great Britain in a declaration, and was positive in his conviction that, except as to the ineffective Spanish empire, and as to the Central and South American States, which he regarded as colonies, we should "oppose with all our means the forcible interpolation of any other power as auxiliary, alibi, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

President Monroe's declaration was a decisive support to Great Britain in her declaration against the outcome of the Congress of Verona, and put an end to all designs of the allied powers to subvert the Spanish-American republics. The late Lord Brougham said of President Monroe's message that "none has ever dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the free men of Europe," and Sir James Mackintosh said that it could not "be contemplated without the utmost pleasure by every enlightened man."

Russia, Great Britain, and the United States were the three great powers which then controlled the continent of North America, and the United States has since succeeded to all the rights of Russia. The principle of the Monroe doctrine is accepted by the Central and South American republics as essential to their autonomy.

Time and again have the principal powers of Europe combined to lay down principles concerning their own continent, to which all nations have been required to give heed, under the plea of the general balance of power and the peace of Europe.

The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818; the intervention in the Ottoman Empire in 1840, and in the Heligoland revolution of 1850, which resulted in the restoration of the King of the Netherlands; the treaties of Paris of 1856, which guaranteed the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, and practically closed the Dardanelles to the ships of war of all other nations, are all familiar examples of interventions authorized by the law of nations.

President Monroe declared what acts by a foreign power against a Spanish-American republic on this hemisphere should be deemed unfriendly to the United States and the reason therefor.

Religious rule has ever been formulated in public international law concerning the general right of interference which would be applicable to every case.

The sincerely honest, candid, and weighty reasons put forth by President Monroe in 1823, in support of his declaration of a principle of public international law as applicable to this hemisphere, will ever receive the enthusiastic and potential support of Americans, as George III. styled the people of the United States in the treaty of 1783, and the sooner the administration of President Monroe is recognized as a serious fact the better it will be for the peace of the world.

NEW YORK, Dec. 20. ASA BIRD GARDINER.